Exhibit 95-B

Redacted Version of Document Sought to be Sealed

Case 3:18-md-02843-VC Document 1086-42 Filed 12/12/22 Page 2 of 12 CONFIDENTIAL

1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
2	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
3		
4	IN RE: FACEBOOK, INC., MDL No. 2843	
5	CONSUMER USER PROFILE Case No.	
6	LITIGATION 18-md-02843-VC-JSC	
7	This document relates to:	
8	ALL ACTIONS	
9		
10	**CONFIDENTIAL**	
11		
12	ZOOM DEPOSITION OF FACEBOOK's 30(b)(6)	
13	CORPORATE REPRESENTATIVE - MICHAEL DUFFEY	
14	(Reported Remotely via Video & Web Videoconference)	
15	Palo Alto, California (Deponent's location)	
16	Wednesday, June 2, 2022	
17	Volume I	
18		
19	STENOGRAPHICALLY REPORTED BY:	
20	REBECCA L. ROMANO, RPR, CSR, CCR	
21	California CSR No. 12546	
22	Nevada CCR No. 827	
	Oregon CSR No. 20-0466	
23	Washington CCR No. 3491	
24	JOB NO. 5234611	
25	PAGES 1 - 194	
	Page 1	

Case 3:18-md-02843-VC Document 1086-42 Filed 12/12/22 Page 3 of 12 CONFIDENTIAL

1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
2	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
3		
	IN RE: FACEBOOK, INC., MDL No. 2843	
4	CONSUMER USER PROFILE Case No.	
	LITIGATION 18-md-02843-VC-JSC	
5		
6	This document relates to:	
7	ALL ACTIONS	
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15	DEPOSITION OF MICHAEL DUFFEY, taken on	
16	behalf of the Plaintiffs, with the deponent located	
17	in Palo Alto, California, commencing at	
18	9:14 a.m., Wednesday, June 3, 2022, remotely	
19	reported via Video & Web videoconference before	
20	REBECCA L. ROMANO, a Certified Shorthand Reporter,	
21	Certified Court Reporter, Registered Professional	
22	Reporter.	
23		
24		
25		
	Page 2	

Case 3:18-md-02843-VC Document 1086-42 Filed 12/12/22 Page 4 of 12 CONFIDENTIAL

1	APPEARANCES OF COUNSEL
2	(All parties appearing via Web videoconference)
3	
4	For the Plaintiffs:
5	BLEICHMAR FONTI & AULD LLP
6	BY: LESLEY E. WEAVER
7	BY: ANNE K. DAVIS
8	BY: JOSHUA SAMRA
9	Attorneys at Law
10	555 12th Street
11	Suite 1600
12	Oakland, California 94607
13	(415) 445-4003
14	lweaver@bfalaw.com
15	adavis@bfalaw.com
16	jsamra@bfalaw.com
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	////
	Page 3

Case 3:18-md-02843-VC Document 1086-42 Filed 12/12/22 Page 5 of 12 CONFIDENTIAL

1	APPEARANCES OF COUNSEL
2	(All parties appearing via Web videoconference)
3	
4	KELLER ROHRBACK L.L.P.
5	BY: CARI CAMPEN LAUFENBERG
6	BY: DEREK W. LOESER
7	Attorneys at Law
8	1201 Third Avenue
9	Suite 3200
10	Seattle, Washington 98101
11	(206) 623-1900
12	claufenberg@kellerrohrback.com
13	dloeser@kellerrohrback.com
14	
15	For Facebook, Inc.:
16	GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP
17	BY: RUSSELL H. FALCONER
18	Attorney at Law
19	2001 Ross Avenue
20	Suite 2100
21	Dallas, Texas 75201
22	(214) 698-3170
23	rfalconer@gibsondunn.com
24	
25	////
	Page 4

Case 3:18-md-02843-VC Document 1086-42 Filed 12/12/22 Page 6 of 12 CONFIDENTIAL

```
1
                APPEARANCES OF COUNSEL(cont'd)
2
     (All parties appearing via Web videoconference)
3
4
    For Facebook, Inc.:
5
          GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP
6
          BY:
               YEKATERINA REYZIS
          Attorney at Law
8
          333 South Grand Avenue
9
          Los Angeles, California 90071-3197
          (213) 229-7907
10
11
          yreyzis@gibsondunn.com
12
    and
13
          BY: DAYNA ZOLLE HAUSER
14
          BY:
               HANNAH REGAN-SMITH
15
          Attorneys at Law
16
          1801 California Street
17
          Suite 4200
18
          Denver, Colorado 80202-2642
19
          (303) 298-5700
20
          dzhauser@gibsondunn.com
21
          hregan-smith@gibsondunn.com
22
23
24
    /////
25
                                                Page 5
```

Case 3:18-md-02843-VC Document 1086-42 Filed 12/12/22 Page 7 of 12 CONFIDENTIAL

```
1
                APPEARANCES OF COUNSEL(cont'd)
 2
     (All parties appearing via Web videoconference)
 3
     For Facebook, Inc.:
 4
 5
          GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP
6
               ROSEMARIE T. RING
          Attorney at Law
8
          555 Mission Street
          Suite 3000
9
          San Francisco, California 94105-0921
10
11
          (415) 393-8247
12
          rring@gibsondunn.com
13
14
          JAMS
15
               DANIEL B. GARRIE
          BY:
16
          Special Master
17
          555 W. 5th Street
18
          32nd Floor
19
          Los Angeles, California 90013
20
          (213) 253-9706
21
          dgarrie@jamsadr.com
22
23
24
     /////
25
                                                Page 6
```

Case 3:18-md-02843-VC Document 1086-42 Filed 12/12/22 Page 8 of 12 CONFIDENTIAL

```
1
                      APPEARANCES (cont'd)
     (All parties appearing via Web videoconference)
 2
 3
 4
     ALSO PRESENT:
          Ian Chen, Associate General Counsel,
 5
     Meta Platforms
 6
 7
          John Macdonell, Videographer
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
     /////
25
                                                  Page 7
```

Case 3:18-md-02843-VC Document 1086-42 Filed 12/12/22 Page 9 of 12 CONFIDENTIAL

1	MR. FALCONER: Objection. Form.	10:02:37
2	THE DEPONENT: Switchboard and DYI are	
3	very similar in the information that is captured in	
4	a snapshot. Switchboard has some additional	
5	information that DYI doesn't pertaining to Facebook	10:03:03
6	groups and advertising accounts.	
7	Q. (By Ms. Weaver) And specifically, does	
8	Switchboard contain relating to Facebook groups and	
9	advertising accounts that DYI does not?	
10	A. My understanding is that DYI doesn't have	10:03:49
11	information related to whether a user is an	
12	administrator of a particular Facebook group. I	
13	don't believe DYI has information related to a	
14	user's advertising accounts.	
15	Q. And when you say "a user's advertising	10:04:13
16	accounts," what do you mean?	
17	A. If a user is selling ads on Facebook.	
18	Q. So for the record, Switchboard has	
19	information regarding users' advertisers' accounts	
20	that are used to sell ads on Facebook; is that	10:04:46
21	correct?	
22	A. I'm not I'm not sure of the exact	
23	information relating to advertising accounts in	
24	Switchboard. That would be a question for the law	
25	enforcement response team.	10:05:06
		Page 40

Case 3:18-md-02843-VC Document 1086-42 Filed 12/12/22 Page 10 of 12 CONFIDENTIAL

1	Q. What is the law enforcement response	10:05:07
2	team?	
3	A. That that team is is receives	
4	subpoenas and requests from law enforcement	
5	regarding individual users at Facebook.	10:05:31
6	Q. And why does the law enforcement response	
7	team use Switchboard as opposed to DYI tool?	
8	MR. FALCONER: Objection. Beyond the	
9	scope of the notice.	
10	And, Mr. Duffey, again, I'll just caution	10:05:49
11	you: Don't reveal any privileged communications	
12	you may have had in the course of your work at the	
13	company in answering that question.	
14	THE DEPONENT: I don't know I don't	
15	know the the all of the reasons why the law	10:06:17
16	enforcement response team uses Switchboard. I know	
17	that Switchboard was a tool used by that team	
18	before DYI. The ability to download your	
19	information was available to users.	
20	I I I think that it the law	10:06:39
21	enforcement response team can produce records to	
22	law enforcement in response to subpoena in a more	
23	usable way than DYI has available to it as a	
24	download.	
25	Q. (By Ms. Weaver) And when you say "in a	10:07:07
		Page 41

Case 3:18-md-02843-VC Document 1086-42 Filed 12/12/22 Page 11 of 12 CONFIDENTIAL

1	more usable way," what do you mean?	10:07:08
		10.07.00
2	A. In a, you know like a PDF record.	
3	Q. And does the Switchboard tool also have	
4	the ability to retrieve information not contained	
5	in DYI that would include, for example,	
	is not	
7	captured by the DYI tool, setting aside the two	
8	examples that you earlier identified?	
9	A. I don't believe so, no. If a user	
10	deletes Switchboard, similar to DYI, is a	10:08:01
11		
13	take the Switchboard snapshot	
	Switchboard,	
<u> </u>		10:08:29
16	Q. Does the law enforcement response team	
17	use any tools other than Switchboard to collect and	
18	provide information about users in response to	
19	subpoenas?	
20	MR. FALCONER: Objection. Beyond the	10:08:42
21	scope of the notice.	
22	THE DEPONENT: I don't know.	
23	Q. (By Ms. Weaver) Who would know?	
24	MR. FALCONER: Same objection.	
25	THE DEPONENT: Somebody somebody on	10:09:03
		Page 42

Case 3:18-md-02843-VC Document 1086-42 Filed 12/12/22 Page 12 of 12 CONFIDENTIAL

1	Q. Can you identify which data in Hive was	11:09:42
2	placed on legal hold for this case?	
3	A. No, I can't.	
4	Q. Can anyone?	
5	A. Can you can we go back two questions	11:10:09
6	ago? Just so I I understand the question.	
7	Q. Yeah. No problem.	
8	Let me try it this way. Was any data in	
9	Hive placed on legal hold for this case?	
10	A. Yes.	11:10:33
11	Q. What data in Hive was placed on legal	
12	hold for this case?	
13	A. I understand that there are 137 Hive	
14	tables placed on legal hold for the	
15	Cambridge Analytica matter. We don't maintain a	11:10:51
16	description or a description of the fields or	
17	Hive tables that have been placed be on hold.	
18	If if I were to you know, needed to	
19	understand what data from those 137 tables, that	
20	would be a a question for the E-discovery data	11:11:34
21	science team.	
22	Q. It is possible for Facebook to identify	
23	those 137 Hive tables, correct?	
24	A. Yes. Our data science team could	
25	identify those tables.	11:11:53
		Page 69